arXiv:1611.09267v1 [math.AP] 28 Nov 2016

On Cusp Solutions to a Prescribed Mean Curvature Equation

Alexandra K. Echart & Kirk E. Lancaster
Department of Mathematics, Statistics & Physics
Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas, 67260-0033

Abstract

The nonexistence of "cusp solutions" of prescribed mean curvature boundary value problems in $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ when Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is proven in certain cases and an application to radial limits at a corner is mentioned.

1 Introduction

Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with locally Lipschitz boundary and $\mathcal{O} = (0,0) \in \partial\Omega$ and $H \in C^{1,\beta}\left(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}\right)$, for some $\beta \in (0,1)$. Let polar coordinates relative to $\mathcal{O}$ be denoted by r and θ and let $B_\delta(\mathcal{O})$ be the open ball in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of radius δ about $\mathcal{O}$. We shall assume there exists a $\delta^* > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0,\pi)$ such that $\partial\Omega \cap B_{\delta^*}(\mathcal{O})$ consists of two smooth arcs $\partial^+\Omega^*$ and $\partial^-\Omega^*$, whose tangent lines approach the lines $L^+ : \theta = \alpha$ and $L^- : \theta = -\alpha$, respectively, as the point $\mathcal{O}$ is approached and for each $\theta \in (-\alpha, \alpha)$, there exists an $r(\theta) > 0$ such that $\{(r\cos(\theta), r\sin(\theta)) : 0 < r < r(\theta)\} \subset \Omega$. Set $\Omega^* = \Omega \cap B_{\delta^*}(\mathcal{O})$.



Figure 1: The domain Ω^*

Consider a solution $f \in C^2(\Omega)$ of the prescribed mean curvature equation

$$\operatorname{div}(Tf)(x,y) = 2H(x,y,f(x,y)) \quad \text{for} \quad (x,y) \in \Omega^*, \tag{1}$$

which satisfies the conditions

$$\sup_{(x,y)\in\Omega^*} |f(x,y)| < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{(x,y)\in\Omega^*} |H(x,y,f(x,y))| < \infty, \tag{2}$$

where $Tf = \frac{\nabla f}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla f|^2}}$; examples of such functions might arise as solutions of a Dirichlet or contact angle boundary value problem for (1). We are interested in the radial limits of f :

$$Rf(\theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{r\downarrow 0} f(r\cos(\theta), r\sin(\theta)), \quad -\alpha < \theta < \alpha. \tag{3}$$

When $\lim_{\partial^+\Omega^* \ni (x,y)\to\mathcal{O}} f(x,y)$ exists, we define $Rf(\alpha)$ to be this limit and when $\lim_{\partial^-\Omega^* \ni (x,y)\to\mathcal{O}} f(x,y)$ exists, we define $Rf(-\alpha)$ to be this limit.

There are examples in which the radial limits do not exist for any $\theta \in (-\alpha,\alpha)$ ([9, 12]). For solutions of boundary value problems which satisfy appropriate conditions, $Rf(\theta)$ can be proven to exist for $\theta \in [-\alpha,\alpha] \setminus J$, where J is a countable subset of $(-\alpha,\alpha)$ (e.g. [3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13]). We know of no examples in which $J \neq \emptyset$ and we ask if $J = \emptyset$ always holds; this is related to the existence of *cusp solutions*.

A *cusp solution* for (1) is a domain $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and a solution f of (1) in Λ such that $\partial\Lambda \setminus \{\mathcal{O}, A, B\} = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3$, where $A, B, \mathcal{O}$ are distinct points on $\partial\Lambda$, Γ_1, Γ_2 and Γ_3 are disjoint, smooth (open) arcs with respective endpoints $\{A,\mathcal{O}\}$, $\{B,\mathcal{O}\}$ and $\{A,B\}$, Γ_1 and Γ_2 are tangent at $\mathcal{O}$ (so $\overline{\Lambda}$ has an "outward" cusp at $\mathcal{O}$; see Figure 2, which has a cusp at $(0,0)$), $f(x,y) = c_j$ when $(x,y) \in \Gamma_j$ $(j = 1,2)$, $c_1 < c_2$, and, for each $c \in (c_1,c_2)$, the level curves $\{(x,y) \in \Lambda : f(x,y) = c\}$ are tangent at $\mathcal{O}$ (e.g. §5 of [12]). (Capillary surfaces in cusp regions were studied in [1, 14].) In cases where cusp solutions do not exist, we know that $J = \emptyset$.

In [12, 13], the nonexistence of cusp solutions is proven when (a) $H \in C^{1,\delta}\left(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}\right)$ $(\delta \in (0,1))$ and $H(x,y,z)$ is strictly increasing in z for each $(x,y) \in \overline{\Omega}$ or (b) H is real-analytic. The proof in [12] for case (a) involves a "local" argument while that for case (b) involves a "global" argument which shows that (2) is violated. Using a "local" argument, we shall prove

Theorem 1. *Suppose Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with locally Lipschitz boundary, $\mathcal{O} = (0,0) \in \partial\Omega$ and $H \in C^{1,\beta}\left(\overline{\Omega^*} \times \mathbb{R}\right)$ for some $\beta \in (0,1)$. Let $f \in C^2(\Omega^*)$ satisfy (1) and (2). Suppose $H(x,y,z)$ is weakly increasing in z for (x,y) in a neighborhood of $(0,0)$. Then f cannot have a cusp solution (i.e. there is no "cusp region" $\Lambda \subset \Omega$ such that (Λ, f) is a cusp solution).*

We can exclude cusp solutions when H vanishes in the "cusp direction," which we may assume is the direction of the positive $x-$axis (see Figure 2).

Theorem 2. *Suppose Λ is a cusp domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$, $\partial\Lambda$ is tangent to $\vec{i}$ at $\mathcal{O}$, $H \in C^{1,\beta}\left(\overline{\Lambda} \times \mathbb{R}\right)$ for some $\beta \in (0,1)$, $f \in C^2(\Lambda)$ satisfies (1) and (2) and there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$H(x,0,z) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad (x,z) \in [0,\delta] \times [\liminf_{\Lambda \ni (x,y) \to \mathcal{O}} f(x,y), \limsup_{\Lambda \ni (x,y) \to \mathcal{O}} f(x,y)].$$

Then (Λ, f) cannot be a cusp solution.

What can we say when $H(x,y,z)$ is strictly decreasing in z? Unfortunately, as the following example illustrates, we cannot exclude cusp solutions in this case, even when H is real-analytic; a "global" argument (like [12], page 176) is required to exclude cusp solutions when H is real-analytic. Thus, for example, the reasoning in 3B of [1] cannot be used when $\kappa < 0$.

Example 1. *Consider the cone $\mathcal{C} = \{X(\theta,t) : 0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2}, 0 < t < \infty\}$, where*

$$X(\theta,t) = t(\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta) - 1, 1).$$

Set $\Lambda = \{t(\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta) - 1) : 0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}, 1 < t < 2\}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{C} \cap \left(\mathbb{R}^2 \times [1,2]\right)$. A straightforward computation shows that the mean curvature (with respect to the upward normal) is

$$H(\theta,t) = \frac{3 - 2\sin(\theta)}{2t\left(1 + (1 - \sin(\theta))^2\right)^{3/2}};$$

in other words, $H(x,y,z) = \frac{z^2 - 2yz}{2(y^2+z^2)^{3/2}}$. Now $\frac{y}{z} = \sin(\theta) - 1 \in [-1,0]$ and $x = 0$ iff $\theta = \pi/2$; another calculation yields

$$2\frac{\partial H}{\partial z}(x,y,z) = -\frac{z^3}{\left(y^2+z^2\right)^{5/2}}\left(1 - 4\left(\frac{y}{z}\right) - 2\left(\frac{y}{z}\right)^2 + 2\left(\frac{y}{z}\right)^3\right) < 0.$$

Finally observe that $\mathcal{S}$ is the graph of a cusp solution and satisfies (2) in Λ.

The hypotheses of [3] include the assumption that H satisfies one of the conditions which guarantees that cusp solutions do not exist; the following Corollary is a consequence of Theorem 1 and [3]. (A second corollary, similar to Corollary 1, follows by applying Theorem 1 to Theorems 1 & 2 of [4].)

Corollary 1. *([3]) Suppose Ω, f and H satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1 and either*

(i) $\alpha \in \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi\right)$ or

(ii) $\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{\pi}{2}\right]$ and one of $Rf(\alpha)$ or $Rf(-\alpha)$ exists.

Then $Rf(\theta)$ exists for each $\theta \in (-\alpha, \alpha)$ and $Rf \in C^0\left((-\alpha,\alpha)\right)$. If $Rf(\alpha)$ exists, then $Rf \in C^0\left((-\alpha,\alpha]\right)$. If $Rf(-\alpha)$ exists, then $Rf \in C^0\left([-\alpha,\alpha)\right)$.



Figure 2: The cusp domain Λ

2 Proof of Theorem 1

Suppose (Λ, f) is a cusp solution and $\Lambda \subset \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < x < a,\ |y| < x\}$, $c_1 < c_2$ and the $c-$level curves of f in Λ are tangent to the positive $x-$axis at $\mathcal{O}$ for $c_1 \leq c \leq c_2$, for some $a > 0$ (see Figure 2). Since $H \in C^{1,\beta}\left(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}\right)$, $f \in C^3(\Omega)$ and, as in [12, 13], there exist an (open) rectangle $R_0 = (0,a)\times(c_1,c_2)$ and $g \in C^3(R)$ (where $R = \overline{R_0}$) such that the graph of f over Λ, $\mathcal{G}$, is the set $\{(x, g(x,z), z) : (x,z) \in R_0\}$ (i.e. $z = f(x,y)$ iff $y = g(x,z)$ for $(x,z) \in R_0$ and $(x,y) \in \Lambda$) and $g(0,z) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(0,z) = 0$ for $c_1 \leq z \leq c_2$. We may assume that $|\nabla g(x,z)| \leq 1$ for $(x,z) \in R$.

The (upward) unit normal to the graph of f, $\mathcal{G}$, is

$$\vec{N}(x,y,z) = \frac{(-f_x(x,y), -f_y(x,y), 1)}{\sqrt{1 + f_x^2(x,y) + f_y^2(x,y)}}$$

and $\operatorname{div}(Tf)(x,y) = 2\vec{H}(x,y,z) \cdot \vec{N}(x,y,z)$ for $(x,y,z) \in \mathcal{G}$, where $2\vec{H}$ is the mean curvature vector of $\mathcal{G}$. Then

$$\operatorname{sgn}(g_z(x,z))\vec{N}(x,y,z) = \frac{(g_x(x,z), -1, g_z(x,z)))}{\sqrt{1 + g_x^2(x,z) + g_z^2(x,z)}}.$$

Since $\operatorname{div}(Tg) = 2\vec{H} \cdot (-g_x, 1, -g_z)/\sqrt{1 + g_x^2 + g_z^2}$, we see that

$$\operatorname{div}(Tg)(x,z) = 2\vec{H}(x,y,z) \cdot (-\operatorname{sgn}(g_z(x,z)))\vec{N}(x,y,z) \quad \text{for } (x,y,z) \in \mathcal{G}.$$

(Of course, if $g_z(x,z) = 0$ for some $(x,z) \in R$ with $x > 0$, then $\mathcal{G}$ has a horizontal unit normal at an interior point of Ω, which contradicts our hypothesis $f \in C^2(\Omega)$; hence $g_z(x,z) \neq 0$ when $(x,z) \in R$ with $x > 0$.)

Let us assume $\operatorname{sgn}(g_z(x,z)) = \operatorname{sgn}(f_y(x, g(x,z))) = +1$ for $(x,z) \in R$ with $x > 0$; the opposite choice will lead to the same (eventual) conclusion that cusp solutions do not exist. Then

$$Mg(x,z) = -2H(x, g(x,z), z),$$

where $Mg = \nabla \cdot Tg = \operatorname{div}(Tg)$. Suppose there exist a $\delta_1 > 0$ such that $H(x,y,z)$ is weakly increasing in z for each $(x,y) \in \Lambda$ and $z \in [c_1, c_2]$ when $x^2 + y^2 \leq \delta_1^2$. We may assume $a \leq \delta_1$.

Fix $\epsilon \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}(c_2 - c_1)\right)$ and set $\tilde{c}_1 = c_1 + \epsilon$ and $\tilde{c}_2 = c_2 - \epsilon$; notice that $\tilde{c}_2 > \tilde{c}_1$. Set

$$g_j(x,z) := g\left(x, z + \tilde{c}_j\right) \quad \text{for } 0 \le x \le a,\ -\epsilon \le z \le \epsilon, \quad j = 1,2, \tag{4}$$

and define $h = g_1 - g_2$.

If $h(x_0, z_0) = 0$ for some $(x_0, z_0) \in (0, a] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$, then the graph of f fails the vertical line test since $(x_0, y_0, z_0 + \tilde{c}_1)$ and $(x_0, y_0, z_0 + \tilde{c}_2)$ are both points on the graph of f, where $y_0 = g_1(x_0, z_0)$ $(= g_2(x_0, z_0))$. Thus $h(x,z) \neq 0$ for all $0 < x \le a,\ -\epsilon \le z \le \epsilon$. Since $\operatorname{sgn}(g_z(x,z)) = +1$ when $(x,z) \in (0,a] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$, we see that $h(x,z) < 0$ for all $(x,z) \in (0,a] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$. (This is essentially the argument in [12] (at the bottom of page 175) since $h(0,z) > 0$ is the only option available there.)

Define

$$K(x,y) = 2H(x, y, \tilde{c}_1 + \epsilon), \quad 0 \le x \le a,\ (x,y) \in \Lambda.$$

and $d(x,z) = 2H(x, g(x,z), \tilde{c}_1 + \epsilon) - 2H(x, g(x,z), z)$. Notice that $d(x, z + \tilde{c}_1) \ge 0$ and $d(x, z + \tilde{c}_2) \le 0$ when $(x,z) \in [0,a] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon]$. Now, for each $j = 1, 2$, g_j is a solution of the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} Mg_j(x,z) &= -K(x, g_j(x,z)) + d(x, z + \tilde{c}_j) \quad \text{for } \ (x,z) \in [0,a] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \\ g_j(0,z) &= \frac{\partial g_j}{\partial x}(0,z) = 0 \quad \text{for } \ z \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, as in [6], pp. 263-4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= Mg_1(x,z) - Mg_2(x,z) + 2H(x, g_1(x,z), z + \tilde{c}_1) - 2H(x, g_2(x,z), z + \tilde{c}_2) \\ &= Lh(x,z) - d(x, z + \tilde{c}_1) + d(x, z + \tilde{c}_2), \end{aligned}$$

where, setting $D_1 := \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ and $D_2 := \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$,

$$Lh = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} a^{i,j} D_{ij} h + \sum_{i=1}^{2} b^i D_i h + ch; \tag{5}$$

here

$$a^{i,j}(x,z) = e^{i,j}(Dg_1(x,z)) \quad \text{for } \ i,j = 1,2, \tag{6}$$

with $e^{1,1}(p,q) = (1+q^2)W^{-3}$, $e^{1,2}(p,q) = e^{2,1}(p,q) = -pqW^{-3}$, $e^{2,2}(p,q) = (1+p^2)W^{-3}$, $W = W(p,q) = \sqrt{1 + p^2 + q^2}$,

$$b^1(x,z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} D_{ij} g_2(x,z) \frac{\partial e^{i,j}}{\partial p}(\xi_1, (g_1)_z(x,z)), \tag{7}$$

$$b^2(x,z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} D_{ij} g_2(x,z) \frac{\partial e^{i,j}}{\partial q}((g_2)_x(x,z), \xi_2) \tag{8}$$

and $c(x,z) = \frac{\partial K}{\partial y}(x,\xi) = 2\frac{\partial H}{\partial y}(x,\xi,\tilde{c}_1+\epsilon)$, for some ξ between $g_1(x,z)$ and $g_2(x,z)$, ξ_1 between $(g_1)_x(x,z)$ and $(g_2)_x(x,z)$ and ξ_2 between $(g_1)_z(x,z)$ and $(g_2)_z(x,z)$.

Notice that $a^{i,j} \in C^1(R)$ for $i,j = 1,2$, $b^i \in L^\infty(R)$ for $i = 1,2$ and $c \in L^\infty(R)$. Now $h(0,z) = \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(0,z) = 0$ for $|z| \le \epsilon$ and

$$Lh(x,z) = d(x,z+\tilde{c}_1) - d(x,z+\tilde{c}_2) \ge 0, \quad (x,z) \in [0,a] \times [-\epsilon,\epsilon]. \tag{9}$$

From (9) and the Hopf boundary point lemma (e.g. [6], Lemma 3.4), we have

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(0,z) < 0 \quad \text{for each} \quad z \in (-\epsilon,\epsilon)$$

and this contradicts the fact that $h_x(0,z) = 0$ if $z \in [-\epsilon,\epsilon]$. Thus we have proven Theorem 1.

Remark 1. *The assumption that H is weakly increasing in z is equivalent to one in the (weak) comparison principle (e.g. Theorem 10.1 in [6]; Theorem 5.1 in [5]), which plays a critical role here.*

3 Proof of Theorem 2

Suppose (Λ, f) is a cusp solution and $\Lambda \subset \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < x < a,\ |y| < x\}$, $c_1 < c_2$ and the $c-$level curves of f in Λ are tangent to the positive $x-$axis at $\mathcal{O}$ for $c_1 \le c \le c_2$, for some $a > 0$ (see Figure 2). As before, there exist an (open) rectangle $R_0 = (0,a) \times (c_1,c_2)$ and $g \in C^3(R)$ such that the graph of f over Λ, $\mathcal{G}$, is the set $\{(x,g(x,z),z) : (x,z) \in R_0\}$ and $g(0,z) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(0,z) = 0$ for $c_1 \le z \le c_2$. We shall assume that $|\nabla g(x,z)| \le 1$ for $(x,z) \in R$.

Let us assume there exist $\delta \in (0,a]$ and $d_1, d_2 \in [c_1,c_2]$ with $d_1 < d_2$ such that $H(x,0,z) = 0$ for $0 \le x \le \delta$, $d_1 \le z \le d_2$. Now $g_{xx}(0,z) = 0$ for all $z \in [c_1,c_2]$ (since $\triangle g(0,z) = Mg(0,z) = -2H(0,0,z) = 0$) and

$$H(x,g(x,z),z) = H(x,0,z) + \frac{\partial H}{\partial y}(x,\xi,z)g(x,z) = \frac{\partial H}{\partial y}(x,\xi,z)g(x,z)$$

for some ξ between 0 and $g(x,z)$. We may extend g as an even function in x by setting $g(x,z) = g(-x,z)$ for $-a \le x < 0$, $c_1 \le z \le c_2$, so that $g \in C^2(R \cup R^-)$, where $R^- = \{(-x,z) : (x,z) \in R\}$. Then

$$0 = Mg(x,z) + 2H(x,g(x,z),z) = \tilde{L}g(x,z)$$

where $a^{1,1}(x,z) = \frac{1+g_z^2(x,z)}{W^3}$, $a^{1,2}(x,z) = -\frac{g_x(x,z)g_z(x,z)}{W^3}$, $a^{2,2}(x,z) = \frac{1+g_x^2(x,z)}{W^3}$, $W(x,z) = \sqrt{1+g_x^2(x,z)+g_z^2(x,z)}$, $a^{1,2} = a^{2,1}$, $\tilde{c}(x,z) = 2H_y(x,\xi,z)$ and

$$\tilde{L}u = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} a^{i,j} D_{ij} u + \tilde{c}u.$$

Since $|\nabla g(x,z)| \leq 1$ for $(x,z) \in R$, $\tilde{L}$ is uniformly elliptic in R. Notice that $a^{i,j} \in C^1(R)$ for $i,j = 1,2$ and $\tilde{c} \in C^0(R)$. Since $g \in C^2(R \cup R^-)$, Theorems 1^* and 2^* of [7] imply that for each $z \in (d_1, d_2)$, there exist a natural number n and real constants e_1 and e_n, not both zero, such that

$$g_x(\rho\cos(\theta), z + \rho\sin(\theta)) = \rho^n \left(e_1\cos(n\theta) + e_2\sin(n\theta)\right) + o(\rho^n)$$

and

$$g_z(\rho\cos(\theta), z + \rho\sin(\theta)) = \rho^n \left(e_2\cos(n\theta) - e_1\sin(n\theta)\right) + o(\rho^n)$$

as $\rho \to 0$. Since $g_x(0,z) = 0$ and $g_z(0,z) = 0$ for $z \in [c_1, c_2]$, we see that

$$e_1\cos(n\pi/2) + e_2\sin(n\pi/2) = 0, \qquad e_2\cos(n\pi/2) - e_1\sin(n\pi/2) = 0$$

and so $e_1 = e_2 = 0$. This contradicts the fact that at least one of e_1 or e_2 is non-zero. Thus we have proven Theorem 2.

4 Radial Limits

When radial limits for (1) exist, they behave in a different manner than do radial limits of, for example, Laplace's equation (e.g. [2]). In particular, if f is a solution of (1) and the radial limits $Rf(\theta)$ exist for $\theta \in (-\alpha, \alpha)$, then they behave in one of the following ways:

(i) $Rf : (-\alpha, \alpha) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a constant function (i.e. f has a nontangential limit at $\mathcal{O}$).

(ii) There exist α_1 and α_2 so that $-\alpha \leq \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \leq \alpha$ and Rf is constant on $(-\alpha, \alpha_1]$ and $[\alpha_2, \alpha)$ and strictly increasing or strictly decreasing on (α_1, α_2).

(iii) There exist $\alpha_1, \alpha_L, \alpha_R, \alpha_2$ so that $-\alpha \leq \alpha_1 < \alpha_L < \alpha_R < \alpha_2 \leq \alpha, \alpha_R = \alpha_L + \pi$, and Rf is constant on $(-\alpha, \alpha_1], [\alpha_L, \alpha_R]$, and $[\alpha_2, \alpha)$ and either strictly increasing on $(\alpha_1, \alpha_L]$ and strictly decreasing on $[\alpha_R, \alpha_2)$ or strictly decreasing on $(\alpha_1, \alpha_L]$ and strictly increasing on $[\alpha_R, \alpha_2)$.

References

[1] Y. Aoki and D. Siegel, *Bounded and unbounded capillary surfaces in a cusp domain*, Pacific J. Math. **Vol. 257**, No. 1 (2012), 143–165.

[2] H. S. Bear and G. N. Hile, *Behaviour of solutions of elliptic differential inequalities near a point of discontinuous boundary data*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 8 (1983), 1175–1197.

[3] M. Entekhabi and K. E. Lancaster, *Radial Limits of Bounded Nonparametric PMC Surfaces*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics 283-2 (2016), 341–351. (https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.05288)

[4] M. Entekhabi and K. E. Lancaster, *Radial Limits of Capillary Surfaces at Corners*, submitted to the Pacific J. Math. (https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.01836)

[5] Robert Finn, *Equilibrium Capillary Surfaces*, Vol 284 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.

[6] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, second edition, Springer-Verlag, 1983.

[7] P. Hartman and A. Wintner, *On the local Behavior of Solutions of Non-Parabolic Partial Differential Equations*, Amer. J. Math **75**, No. 3 (1953), 449–476.

[8] K. E. Lancaster, *Nonparametric minimal surfaces in* $\mathbb{R}^3$ *whose boundaries have a jump discontinuity*, Inter. J. Math. Math. Sci. **11** (1988), 651–656.

[9] K. E. Lancaster, *Existence and nonexistence of radial limits of minimal surfaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **106** (1989), 757–762.

[10] K. E. Lancaster, *Boundary behavior near reentrant corners for solutions of certain elliptic equations*, Rend. Circ. Matem. Palermo (2) **40** (1991), 189–214.

[11] K. E. Lancaster, *Remarks on the Behavior of Nonparametric Capillary Surfaces at Corners*, Pacific J. Math. **Vol. 258**, No. 2 (2012), 369–392.

[12] K. E. Lancaster and D. Siegel, *Existence and Behavior of the Radial Limits of a Bounded Capillary Surface at a Corner*, Pacific J. Math. **Vol. 176**, No. 1 (1996), 165–194.

[13] K. E. Lancaster and D. Siegel, *Behavior of a Bounded Non-Parametric* H*-Surface Near a Reentrant Corner*, Zeitschrift für Analysis und ihre Anwendungen **15**, no. 4 (1996), 819–850.

[14] M. Scholz, On the asymptotic behaviour of capillary surfaces in cusps, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. 55:2 (2003), 216–234.